



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,838	11/24/2003	Mickael Gros-Jean	02-GR1-323	3616	
23334	7590 03/17/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI			CHEN, E	CHEN, BRET P	
& BIANCO P.L. ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111			1762		
BOCA RATON, FL 33487			DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006	DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No. Applicant(s)		_		
		10/720,838	GROS-JEAN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit	_		
		B. Chen	1762			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPORTED IN THE MAILING INTERPORT IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INTERPORTED IN THE MAILING INTERPORTED	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication.			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	Since this application is in condition for allows		nsecution as to the merits is			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application	n.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7)	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ed in this National Stage			
* 0	application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		٠.			
	see the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not receive	ca.			
Attachment	• •					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date		ratent Application (PTO-152)			

Page 2

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-15, drawn to a method, classified in class 427, subclass 255.31.

II. Claims 16-32, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 715.

III. Claims 33-39, drawn to a product, classified in class 428, subclass 688.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as etching.

Inventions II and III are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus such as a sputtering apparatus.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as sputtering.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Jose Gutman on September 7, 2005, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

Application/Control Number: 10/720,838 Page 4

Art Unit: 1762

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1417. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bc 3/16/06

BRET CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER